

August 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20391

Southern California is now looking 800 miles to the north to Washington, where the Columbia's runoff into the Pacific is a colossal 151.2 billion gallons a day and is used mostly for power generation, which of course doesn't consume any water at all.

PAYOFF

The West's water planning has paid off: California is the fastest growing, richest State in the Union. Arizona, with a meager annual rainfall of 7.2 inches, is in a better water position now than the humid East.

President Johnson's home State of Texas learned about water from a 4-year drought in the mid-1950's. Mr. Johnson, for one, still remembers; he recalled last week how President Eisenhower came to the rescue. Now the State water commission is studying water needs until 2010, and creating reservoirs and building systems to transfer water from the rain-rich eastern sections to the arid west. Next year, a 322-mile pipeline will bring water from the Safford Dam near Amarillo to 11 cities in the Panhandle. Three years from now, the Trinity River project will begin yielding 1.2 billion gallons of water a day.

While there are encouraging signs around the country that Americans are recognizing that water is one of the Nation's most precious natural resources, the United States is still destroying water sources faster than it is developing them. In the Great Lakes, for example, which contain a quarter of the world's fresh-water supply, water levels are dropping and the pollution levels rising. "To fly over Lake Erie and look down into the cloudy mess of murderous pollution," Udall said recently, "is like reading the flyleaf of a book on the end of civilization." The message seems finally to be getting through. Just last week, the five States involved in the destruction of Lake Erie agreed to try to save it, to try to cut back on the tons of chemical waste that pour into it each minute of the day.

What worries some about the current crises is that complacency in the East threatens to be replaced not by planning, but by hysteria. It is fed by dire projections about future growth in water consumption. These projections show that, by 1980, water consumption will be double what it was in 1950—totaling three-fifths of all recoverable surface waters. And all of this will be tapped by the year 2000. Such predictions may serve to encourage advance planning, but Luna Leopold, among others, questions them. "It seems inconceivable to me that we are going to double land under irrigation," he says by way of example. "Irrigation simply cannot continue to grow at the old rate." Other officials complain that the present emergency in the East is being used to increase the flow of Federal funds out of Washington and into the States and municipalities. "People," says one hydrologist, "are using this drought to sell a bill of goods."

The search for the panacea must, in the experts' opinion, be tempered by the realities of economics, and the possibilities as they exist now. Weather modification is one such grand solution, and authorities such as Revelle consider it worth intensive research. But it would be a mistake to count on it. Rainmaking, for example, has so far been a total failure. President Johnson's desalination bill is designed "to free mankind from Nature's tyranny," but salt-free ocean water can only be transported to inland States at great cost. "The idea that desalination will end all our water problems is just nonsense," says one official.

HIDDEN RESOURCES

The answer more likely lies in the simple, if tedious and undramatic, process of learning more about water supply. There hasn't been a full census of water in the United States since 1954; every current figure is a projection or an estimate, and could be far

off the mark. The estimated water underground is equivalent to 150 years of rainfall in the United States—3,000 times more than is in streams and rivers. Yet it supplies only one-fifth of all the water used in the United States. Where it is brackish in the Midwest, President Johnson's desalting bill can really help. Small community plants employing new techniques could make water available at reasonable costs. At brackish-water plants, such as the one at Freeport, Tex., the technology is being developed, and experience in nuclear desalting techniques will be gained at the proposed reactor in Riverhead, N.Y., which will serve 10,000 people.

Somewhat, too, the tangle of local, State, regional, and Federal responsibilities and rights that water involves, must be straightened out. President Johnson illustrated the complexities when he said in one sentence that "this is a time for Federal action," then added that "Federal action is no substitute for local responsibility." There is no central control over the country's water, no coordinating body. Up-to-date figures on the country's water consumption simply don't exist.

THE LESSON

The formation of such new groups as the President's Water Resources Council and the Department of the Interior's Office of Water Resources Research should certainly help. They may have come into existence none too soon. "Within the next 5 years," predicts Dr. E. D. Eaton, associate director of the office, "the Nation will have to make decisions on water projects running into hundreds of billions of dollars. We just don't know enough about the economics of water right now to do that."

But some knowledge has been gained in the water crisis of 1965. Easterners have learned the hard way what citizens of the arid West have always known. Water is a resource to be cherished, conserved, and fought for if necessary. Like a crop, it must be harvested and used with care and foresight. The alternative is to remain at the mercy of an inconstant Nature, to rely on the unreliable, and sooner or later to run dry.

THE CASE AGAINST THE CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH RUSSIA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has favorably reported a proposed treaty with the Soviet Union to establish consular relations between the two countries. The treaty is now resting on the Executive Calendar where it could be called forth at any time.

Newspaper reports indicate, however, that the Senate Democratic leadership has abandoned its plans to seek Senate ratification of this treaty at this time. I welcome this decision.

For this is a shameful measure which has been shamefacedly handled by those who support it.

How else can we see this proposal when even the administration which gave it birth has acted so as not to expose it to close scrutiny for more than a year?

It was signed in Moscow in June of 1964. President Johnson urged Senate ratification 11 days later. And what has happened since then? Very, very little.

There has been a public hearing, if you care to call it that. One administration witness appeared.

All of this has been discussed in great detail in the minority views filed with the Committee on Foreign Relations and elsewhere.

The point remains and cannot be avoided: this treaty is a founding that has lain on our doorstep for nearly 400 days. And now even its embarrassed parents seem unwilling to ask that we take it in.

When word of the proposed ratification got out—even in a most subtle manner—mail started coming to congressional offices almost totally in opposition to the scheme. This cannot be sloughed off as the outpourings of a small but vocal minority of the radical right. If my mail is any indication of public sentiment on this question, there is a genuine concern—indeed a revolt—against the treaty at the grassroots.

When the American people learn the facts concerning this scheme, there can be no other reaction.

There are so many reasons to say "No" to this request, that each Member of this body could produce a separate one if he wished to do so. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle have done so. For the opposition is not the voice of partisanship. It is a reasoned opposition—a many, many reasoned opposition.

I have not heard one note of opposition that was purely partisan. I have not heard one note of opposition that was purely a quibble or a disgruntled tactic of delay.

No, Mr. President, I have not heard one note of opposition that did not carry with it, beyond all other sounds, the deep note of sincere concern for the Republic and the freedom which we are sworn to protect on its behalf.

The seeming reluctance with which the administration has let this treaty trickle to the doorstep of the Senate is in itself a sign that there is no enthusiasm for the treaty at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue although there seems to be some friendship for it in Foggy Bottom in the precincts of the State Department.

What have we heard on behalf of the treaty? We have heard that it may aid commerce between the Soviet Union and the United States.

But what have we heard against it? We have heard the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—certainly a knowledgeable administration spokesman—characterize it as the realization of a long-sought goal of Soviet intelligence operations.

We have heard a distinguished member of the administration's own party recount the abuse after abuse of Soviet diplomatic privileges in this country.

We have heard representatives of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe, such as the Lithuanian American Council and others, implore us to make clear that this treaty is not to be interpreted to mean that the newly extended consular privileges permit Soviet actions which would legitimize the Soviet conquests of the captive nations.

We have heard other members of this body speak of the incredible immunity granted Soviet personnel, under this treaty; immunity from prosecution for any crime, no matter how treacherous or dangerous.

We have heard ample debunking of that favorite excuse for such dismal exercises; the excuse that says that we will

20392

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19, 1965

reap as much advantages from a few isolated consulates in the Soviet Union as they will from consulates in many of our major cities. We should not need the examination of this treaty to remind us of the differences between permitting the agents of tyranny to work freely in a free country and permitting the agents of freedom to work in the police state maze of a tyranny.

Here again, when only such slender and feathery arguments as that can be used in defense of such a treaty, we can see that the weight of clear need and clear justification is altogether missing.

This treaty seems just a chance gesture, hardly defended, scarcely wanted, and beyond any sensible and searching discussion. It is one of those sometimes gestures of appeasement which we have been known to make before and which—every time without exception—we have come to regret for good and sufficient cause as communism continues to violate its word, violate territory, and violate civilized political behavior around the world.

Mr. President, this treaty carries with it, in its words and scope, so many disadvantages that volumes could and, I hope, will be spoken on them. My hope is to speak of the treaty beyond its own details; to implore its defeat on the basis of the single, overriding basis of the long-term security of the Republic and the long-term cause of freedom throughout the world.

This treaty cannot be ratified in ignorance of what it does to these long-term concerns. This treaty must not be ratified because of those concerns.

This is the wrong treaty, at the wrong time, and it is advocated for all the wrong reasons.

If put before the American people, it would resoundingly be defeated and rejected. If put before the representatives of all the people, it should receive the same answer.

It is an essential function of the Senate that it pull back from the brink of disaster, those administration moves made in silence and often in secrecy which may serve some special and vested departmental interest but which do not serve the interest of the people at large.

We are charged by the Constitution with the balancing of such acts. It is our duty to say "Yes" when the national need is clear and it is our duty, just as loudly to say "No" when the national need clearly is being misinterpreted or even disserved.

It is not wisdom or courtesy that should impel a Member of this body to vote against his conscience and good sense in advising on such a treaty as this. Conscience and good sense both have been examined on this treaty and neither can we there find any friends for it. No. To vote for such a treaty against sense and sensibility would not help this administration. Far from it. It would plunge it, bound by a false solidarity, into a drowning sea of error.

This treaty does not deserve the support of this administration, which has shown its colors so well in opposing communism on other fronts. Indeed it has had very little support. And this

administration does not deserve the stigma of being parent of this treaty. This is why, Mr. President, I say and say again that this treaty is not partisan in sponsorship or in opposition. We are joined, despite party, not so much in opposing simply a treaty as in supporting those principles which this treaty so grievously would weaken.

Let me enumerate. First, and we can never forget it, we are at war now with communism. Only technicalities and diplomatic bowing and scraping keep the dread word itself from official recognition. But the truth is that we are at war with communism. And the equally dreadful truth is that the men with whom some would have us observe this treaty are the same men whose power supports the war against us.

Who in this body honestly can believe that the espionage which we know beyond peradventure would be committed under this treaty would not serve directly or indirectly the forces who are killing our soldiers in Vietnam today?

Who is there in this body who would care to explain this treaty and the espionage which it fosters and protects—explain it to the widow or parent of a marine or paratrooper slain in Vietnam?

No. This treaty is wholly wrong when we are so beleaguered by communism. It is totally wrong and, should it be ratified against the best conscience of the people and their representatives, then not an ocean of blood will wipe out the folly.

This is not a time, as some say who would see this treaty slide past us like a thief in the night, when the Soviet sincerely is seeking new conciliations with us.

Have they moved to extinguish the fires in Latin America; fires fed by the Soviet incursion in Cuba?

Have they moved to end the slow human sacrifice of the Berlin wall?

Have they moved to ease the tensions throughout those corridors and ways of Germany which communism controls?

Have they pinched off the logistics of death flowing into Vietnam?

Have they stilled the shrill voice of domestic communism anywhere?

Have they slowed the clandestine traffic in treachery and spying which is the principal weight of their diplomatic pouches and the chief cargo of their political exports?

They have not. They have not and do not seek friendship in this consular treaty. They seek advantages and opportunities.

They have not and do not seek easing of the tensions between us—they seek ways to work beyond those tensions and to be protected from them, as this treaty would protect them.

Slam the door on this treaty and we do not slam the door on hopes for easing the tensions between us. We would only slam the door on the illusions and the wishful thinking which always have proved so tempting to communism.

Indeed, it is such encouragement which prolong the tensions. Communism, given an inch, always has wanted a hundred miles.

President Johnson sees in Vietnam

precisely a test of our will to resist. He sees in a failure of that will a failure in our efforts to keep the peace. For only the will to resist can keep the peace against aggressors. We all know that.

I see in this treaty a similar test of our will to resist. If this golden gift of espionage and immunity—condemned by utterances from within the administration itself—if this open door to treachery, this one-way street to privilege abused, if this treaty is ratified we will again leave communism convinced that Americans will give, and give, and give, bend, and bend, and bend. And where is the service to peace in that?

God knows that if they thought we would bend and give in in Vietnam we could expect to fight there forever, bleeding endlessly. Our hope on every front is that finally communism will realize that America cannot be bent forever over any tyrant's knee.

Then we can talk of bargaining for we will have something with which to bargain.

Then let this treaty be considered anew along with the thousand and one other gestures that civilized nations can make to form and forge a friendship.

What sort of day would that be? Well, it would be a day in which Communist leaders renounced their creed's worldwide plans for political subversion and dismantled the machinery for it. How can we talk of consular treaties when the Soviet by past performance regard them as only vehicles for unlimited espionage and subversion?

It would be a day when the last Soviet technician and the last Soviet missile had been withdrawn from Cuba. For how can we speak of a consular treaty with Soviet guns still aimed at our shores and from a conquered base in our own hemisphere?

It would be a day in which peoples conquered and held captive could vote freely and openly to establish their own national destiny. For how can we speak of a consular treaty to promote commerce when millions are the victims of a commerce in captivity?

Mr. President, it would be a far different day from this day. And that is why this wrong treaty comes at the wrong time as well as for the wrong reasons.

Ratify this treaty and error is ratified, and communism once again advantaged. Ratify this treaty and we will pay a price in history—and in blood.

Such a consular treaty is to promote the civilized commerce and traffic between nations. Let us pray for the day when such a time will call for such a treaty. But that sort of time must precede the treaty. And this is not the time.

THE RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the recent riots in Los Angeles have given every American cause to wonder about the good and evil forces which are afoot in this country and indeed in the world.

My friend, Mr. Clyde Reed, Jr., editor and publisher of the Parsons (Kans.) Sun, has dealt with many of the ques-